



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,500	01/27/2004	David A. Matthews	MS#304649.01 (5439)	6265
38779	7590	02/05/2009		
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)			EXAMINER	
100 NORTH BROADWAY			AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
17TH FLOOR				
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/05/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/764,500	Applicant(s) MATTHEWS ET AL.
	Examiner NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	Art Unit 2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/10/2008

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 11/18/2008. This action is made **Final**.

B. Claims 1 and 3-33 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 and 3-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Czerwinski et al (US 2004/0066414 A1), herein referred to as "Czerwinski".

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As for claim 1, Czerwinski teaches a computer-implemented method for controlling tiles within a sidebar of a system, the method comprising (par.21 and 36): receiving a request from an originator to manipulate a selected tile in a sidebar (par.37), wherein content of the request to manipulate the selected tile includes at least one of the group comprising: relocating the selected tile within the sidebar (par.37), adding the selected tile to the sidebar, removing the selected tile from the sidebar, hiding the selected tile in the sidebar, banning the selected tile from the sidebar, and showing the selected tile in the sidebar (par.38); in response to receiving said request, determining the originator of said received request; selecting an appropriate manipulation rule set from a plurality of rule sets comprising a user manipulation rule set and an application manipulation rule set, said selecting based on the determined originator of the request any wherein a user manipulation rule set is selected if the-determined originator of the request is a system user, and an application manipulation rule set is selected if the determined originator of the request is an application, wherein said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program; (par.38-40; predefined layouts and user/system defined rules); locating an appropriate manipulation rule within the selected appropriate manipulation rule set based on the determined current status of the selected tile and the content of the received request; and manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule and the content of the received request (par.38-39).

As for claim 3, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the identity of the manipulation requestor is a system user and the content of the request includes adding the selected tile to the sidebar and wherein manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule comprises adding the selected tile to a top of the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 4, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the identity of the manipulation requestor is an application tag and the content of the request includes adding the selected tile to the sidebar and wherein manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule comprises adding the selected tile to a bottom portion of the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 5, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 4, further comprising providing a user notification to instruct a system user regarding removal of the selected tile (par.38).

As for claim 6, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the identity of the manipulation requestor is an application, the content of the request includes request to show showing the selected tile in the sidebar, determining the current status is determined as hidden, and manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule comprises to reveal revealing

the selected tile in the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 7, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, an wherein the identity of the manipulation requestor is an application the content of the request includes request to hide hiding the selected tile, the current status is determined as visible, and manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule comprises hiding the selected tile (par.39).

As for claim 8, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the identity of the manipulation requestor is a system user the content of the request includes removing the selected tile from the sidebar, and manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule comprises IU banning the selected tile from the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 9, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the identity of the manipulation requestor is an application, the content of the request includes showing the selected tile, the current status of the selected tile is determined as banned, and manipulating the selected tile in accordance with the located appropriate manipulation rule comprises refusing to show the tile in the sidebar (par.38; tile removed from group depicts that it does not belong anymore which is the same as a ban in the sense its not displaying with the group anymore; also present are

guide sets defined by user).

As for claim 10, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising providing a user interface option menu for revealing the current tile status to a system user (par.38; additional text and graphics can be associated with tiles).

As for claim 11, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 10, further comprising providing a check mark to indicate a visible tile (par.38; various techniques used to depict tile actions, such as highlighting, fonts, boarders, etc.).

As for claim 12, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 10, further comprising providing a blank space to indicate one of a newly installed and a banned tile (par.38-39).

As for claim 13, Czerwinski teaches a system for controlling tiles within a sidebar when a manipulation request is originated by a system user or by an application to manipulate a selected tile, the system (par. 21) comprising: an input module configured to receiving the manipulation request, wherein content of the manipulation request includes at least one of the group (par.37) comprising: relocating the selected tile within the sidebar, adding the selected tile to the sidebar, removing the selected tile from the sidebar, hiding the selected tile in the sidebar, banning the selected tile from the sidebar, and

showing the selected tile in the sidebar (par.38); a status determination module configured to indicate a current status of the selected tile wherein the current status includes at least one of the group comprising: hidden, visible, newly installed, uninstalled, and banned (par.38); one or more user manipulation rules defining an appropriate disposition of the selected tile based on the indicated current status of the selected tile and the content of the request, wherein only said user manipulation rules are used when the manipulation request originates from the system user (par.39); one or more application manipulation rules defining an appropriate disposition of the selected tile based on the indicated current status of the selected tile and the content of the request, wherein said application manipulation rules and not said user manipulation rules are used when the manipulation request originates from the application, wherein said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program (par.38); and one or more manipulation tools configured to manipulate the selected tile in accordance with the appropriate disposition of the selected tile as defined by the user manipulation rules or the application manipulation rules, the content of the request, and the request originator (par.38-39).

As for claim 14, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, wherein the one or more user manipulation rules cause the selected tile to be added to a top portion of the sidebar upon receiving the manipulation request from the system user (par.38; user is

able to manipulate position of tile).

As for claim 15, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, wherein the one or more application manipulation rules cause the selected tile to be added to a bottom portion of the sidebar upon receiving the manipulation request from the application (par.38).

As for claim 16, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 15, wherein the one or more application manipulation rules further require providing a user notification to instruct the user regarding removal of the selected tile (par.38).

As for claim 17, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, wherein the one or more application manipulation rules provide for showing the selected tile upon receiving an application request after determining the current tile status as hidden (par.38).

As for claim 18, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, wherein the one or more application manipulation rules provide for hiding the selected tile upon receiving an application request and determining the current tile status as visible (par.38).

As for claim 19, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, wherein the one or more user manipulation rules provide for banning the selected tile from the sidebar upon receiving a user request (par.38).

As for claim 20, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, wherein the one or more application manipulation rules, upon determining the current tile status as banned, require refusal to show the selected tile upon receiving an application request (par.38).

As for claim 21, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 13, further comprising a user interface option menu for revealing the current tile status to the system user (par.38).

As for claim 22, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 21, wherein the user interface option menu comprises a status indicator including a check mark to indicate a visible tile (par.39).

As for claim 23, Czerwinski teaches the system of claim 21, wherein the user interface option menu includes a blank status indicator to indicate one of a newly installed and a banned tile (par.38).

As for claim 24, Czerwinski teaches a computer-implemented method for controlling a selected tile within a sidebar upon receiving an application request for manipulation of the selected tile, the method (par.21) comprising: receiving the application request for manipulation of the selected tile (par.37), wherein an application originating said application request is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program, and wherein said request includes content, wherein said content includes at least one of the group (par.37-38) comprising:

relocating the selected tile within the sidebar, adding the selected tile to the sidebar, removing the selected tile from the sidebar, hiding the selected tile in the sidebar, banning the selected tile from the sidebar, and showing the selected tile in the sidebar (par.38); determining a current status of the selected tile in response to the application request wherein the current status is at least one of the group comprising: banned, hidden, newly installed, uninstalled, and visible; selecting an appropriate tile manipulation rule for the application based on the current status of the tile and the content of the request (par.38 and 46); and manipulating the tile in accordance with the selected tile manipulation rule and the content of the request, wherein if the current status is determined to be banned, the selected tile manipulation rule includes refusing entry of the selected tile in the sidebar and refusing to reveal the selected tile (par.39).

As for claim 25, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 24, wherein the current status is determined to be banned and wherein the selected appropriate tile manipulation rule includes refusing entry of the selected tile in the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 26, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 24, wherein the current status is determined as hidden and the selected appropriate tile manipulation rule allows the application to reveal the hidden tile (par.46).

As for claim 27, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 24, wherein the current status is determined as newly installed and the selected appropriate tile manipulation rule that allows entry of the selected tile at a bottom portion of the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 28, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 27, further comprising providing a user notification allowing the user to remove the selected tile (par.40).

As for claim 29, Czerwinski teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 24, wherein the current status is determined as visible and selecting the selected appropriate tile manipulation rule that allows the application to render the tile hidden (par.38).

As for claim 30, Czerwinski teaches a computer-implemented method for controlling a selected tile within a sidebar based on user preferences (par.21), the method comprising: receiving a manipulation request originating from a user, said manipulation request having content including a request to remove the selected tile from the sidebar (par.38); removing the selected tile from the sidebar in response to receiving the user manipulation request (par.38); refusing a request originating from an application to insert the selected tile into the sidebar, wherein said request from the application is

received after removing the selected tile in response to the manipulation request from the user, wherein said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program (par.39); and granting a request originating from the user to insert the selected tile into the sidebar~ wherein the granted request originating from the user is received after removing the selected tile in response to the manipulation request from the user (par.38).

As for claim 31, Czerwinski teaches a computer-readable medium storing computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30 (par.28).

As for claim 32, Czerwinski teaches a method for providing a user with control of the positioning of a selected tile within a sidebar based on user manipulation rules and application manipulation rules, the method comprising: inserting the selected tile in a preferred sidebar position in response to receiving a user originated request to insert the selected tile; inserting the selected tile in less preferred sidebar position in response to receiving an application request to insert the selected tile (par.38), wherein an application originating the application request to insert the selected tile is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program (par.38); and allowing a user to ban the selected tile such that the application associated with the selected tile is prevented from inserting the selected tile in the sidebar (par.38).

As for claim 33, Czerwinski teaches a computer-readable medium storing computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 32 (par.28).

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/18/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues that Czerwinski does not teach the following limitations:

- "in response to receiving said request, determining the originator of said received request;"
- "selecting an appropriate manipulation rule set from a plurality of rule sets comprising a user manipulation rule set and an application manipulation rule set"

- "said selecting based on the determined originator of the request any wherein a user manipulation rule set is selected if the-determined originator of the request is a system user" and "an application manipulation rule set is selected if the determined originator of the request is an application, wherein said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program".

R1. Examiner does not agree Czerwinski provides a detail explanation throughout paragraphs 38-40.

- In paragraph 40 it is explained of a user and system (application/ Operating system (automated)) rule sets to perform by the respective identified party, thus Czerwinski teaches "in response to receiving said request, determining the originator of said received request".
- Also explained mid through paragraph 40 is that the rule sets effects the final presentation of the taskbar and its grouping of elements, such that there are different means of presenting information to the user based on determined parameters (user or system), thus Czerwinski teaches selecting an appropriate manipulation rule set from a plurality of rule sets comprising a user manipulation rule set and an application manipulation rule set
- Further described in paragraph 39 are other rule sets that are called predefined layouts which are rules defined to effect how the presentation of groupings and single elements are displayed to the user to be interacted with

inside of the taskbar and in combination of what was described in paragraph 40 above it is evident that Czerwinski teaches “said selecting based on the determined originator of the request any wherein a user manipulation rule set is selected if the-determined originator of the request is a system user” and “an application manipulation rule set is selected if the determined originator of the request is an application, wherein said application is associated with the selected tile and is an application program other than a tile configuration user interface program”.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
January 29, 2009

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179